



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/921,097	07/31/2001	Ron J. Hudson	108.0004-00000	6784
22882	7590	05/11/2010		
MARTIN & FERRARO, LLP 1557 LAKE O'PINES STREET, NE HARTVILLE, OH 44632			EXAMINER CHOWDHURY, SUMAIYA A	
			ART UNIT 2421	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 05/11/2010	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/921,097

Applicant(s)

HUDSON ET AL.

Examiner

SUMAIYA A. CHOWDHURY

Art Unit

2421

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 January 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-56 and 59-94 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-56, 59-94 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/02)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-56, and 59-94 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
2. Applicant's arguments filed 1/27/10 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

(a) Applicant argues that the prior art does not teach the claim as amended.

In this Office Action, the Examiner has switched Armstrong to be the base reference. Armstrong teaches streaming content from a server to a client. When a user hit the pause button, the video is halted from being streamed from the server, and then a request for supplemental content associated with the video at the time-point at which the video was paused is sent to an ad server. Supplemental content is then streamed to the user. Once the user has finished interacting with the supplemental content, the video is resumed from being streamed at the point it was last left off at. Since Armstrong teaches the user is capable of interacting with the video by hitting a pause button, it would be obvious to combine Armstrong with Krapf since Krapf teaches a video having interface link associated therewith which is interacted with during the streaming of the video. Kutzi was relied on to teach an internet-protocol based network.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-6, 8, 10-21, 23, 25-33, 35, 37-42, 66-67, 71-82 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Armstrong (7017173) in view of Krapf (6483986) and Jutzi (7275254).

As for claims 1 and 31, Armstrong discloses a method for using an interactive video, the method comprising the steps of:

Streaming the video from a remote location and displaying the video on a visual display for a user, the video having supplemental content associated therewith, the supplemental content adapted to be displayed on the visual display and being linked to ancillary content accessible over the network (col. 2, line 60-col. 3, line 3, col. 4, lines 47-63);

Interacting, during the streaming of the video to access the ancillary content – (pause button is selected; col. 5, line 62-col. 6, line 14);

Interrupting, at the remote location, the streaming of the video at a point in time in response to the interacting with the interface link so as to prevent streaming of the video over the network (col. 2, line 62-col. 3, line 3, col. 3, lines 35-39, col. 7, lines 50-54, col. 14, lines 9-16);

transmitting, after interrupting at the remote location the streaming of the video, the transmission of the video at the remote location, a request for ancillary content over the network to a remote site where the ancillary content is stored (col. 7, lines 50-65);

delivering the ancillary content and displaying the ancillary content on the visual display (col. 7, lines 60-66); and

continuing the streaming of the video over the network from the point in time when the streaming of the video was interrupted after the interacting with the interface link (col. 14, lines 9-16).

However, Armstrong fails to disclose:

Internet protocol-based network;

Video having interface link associated therewith which is interacted with during the streaming of the video;

In an analogous art, Krapf teaches:

Video having interface link associated therewith which is interacted with during the streaming of the video (col. 3, lines 44-56);

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Armstrong's invention to include the above mentioned limitation, as taught by Krapf, for the advantage of allowing a user to interact with specific content, thereby providing the user greater control over which supplemental content is provided.

However, Armstrong and Krapf fail to disclose:

Internet protocol-based network;

In an analogous art, Jutzi discloses delivering content over an internet-protocol network (col. 10, lines 47-61, col. 6, lines 6-35);

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Armstrong and Krapf's invention to include the abovementioned limitation, as taught by Jutzi, for the advantage of providing content over a network which provides interactivity.

As for claims 2, 17 and 32, Armstrong discloses interrupting of the streaming of the video includes pausing the video— col. 2, line 60-col. 3, line 3.

As for claim 3, Krapf discloses wherein said interacting step includes interacting with an interface link that is embedded in the video – (The streaming video data transmitted by the broadcast headend includes the alternative subject matter data. Hence, the alternative subject matter data is embedded in the video – col. 6, lines 38-43).

As for claim 4, Krapf discloses wherein said interacting step includes overlaying the interface link on the video on the visual display – (Referring to Fig. 1, the alternative subject matter is overlaid on the video - col. 4, lines 4-15).

As for claims 5 and 20, Krapf discloses wherein the video is received from a cable headend and the interface link (web page) is received from a web server such

that the user could access web data pertinent to the video programming via a modem (col. 8, lines 39-41; fig. 4).

As for claims 6, 21 and 33, Krapf discloses wherein the interface link (web location) is hidden from view until the viewer selects the image, resulting in invoking a linked URL which leads to a web location which provides information related to the image (col. 3, lines 43-56).

As for claims 8, 23 and 35, Krapf discloses wherein different entities in a frame may be associated with different URLs, and may serve to direct the user to the particular web page (primary ancillary content) when the image is selected. The user browses the particular web page which has links on it and then further accesses a link on the web page by selecting it. The link takes the user to a secondary web page (second ancillary content) which allows the user to access additional desired information— col. 4, lines 4-14.

As for claims 10, 25 and 37, Armstrong discloses wherein the user may buy (commercial transaction) a dealer's product through the web page for the advantage of allowing the user to purchase desired goods from his TV set— col. 12, lines 39-45.

As for claims 11, 26 and 38, Krapf discloses wherein the user may purchase good or services. As this is possible, the system inherently has a link to a site adapted

to transact the commercial transaction for the advantage of allowing the process of buying a product from a vendor – col. 12, lines 39-45.

As for claims 12 and 39, Krapf discloses wherein said interacting step includes accessing ancillary content including information relating to the video (The alternative subject matter data is associated with the program of the channel - col. 6, lines 39-42).

As for claims 13 and 40, Krapf discloses wherein said interacting step includes accessing ancillary content including video (The streaming video data includes the alternative subject matter (ancillary content) - col. 6, lines 36-40. The alternative subject matter is saved as compressed video - col. 7, lines 4-9).

As for claims 14, 29 and 41, Krapf discloses the user may purchase a product using the ancillary content for the advantage of allowing the process of buying a product from a vendor – col. 12, lines 39-45.

As for claims 15, 30 and 42, Krapf discloses the video may be associated with different URLs, and may serve to direct the user to a plurality of web sites – col. 4, lines 4-14.

Claim 16 contains the limitations of claim 1 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to that claim. Claim 16 additionally discloses the following which Armstrong teaches:

Accessing, after interrupting at the remote location the streaming of the video, the ancillary content by the user (col. 7, lines 60-66);

Displaying the ancillary content on the visual display (col. 7, lines 60-66);

As for claim 18, Krapf discloses wherein said interacting step includes interacting with an interface link that is embedded in the video – (The streaming video data transmitted by the broadcast headend includes the alternative subject matter data. Hence, the alternative subject matter data is embedded in the video – col. 6, lines 38-43).

As for claim 19, Krapf discloses wherein said interacting step includes overlaying the interface link on the video on the visual display – (Referring to Fig. 1, the alternative subject matter is overlaid on the video - col. 4, lines 4-15).

As for claim 27, Armstrong discloses accessing ancillary content including information relating to the video (col. 4, lines 47-63).

As for claims 28, Armstrong discloses accessing ancillary content including video (col. 8, lines 5-15).

Claims 66 and 67 contains the limitations of claim 1 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims.

As for claims 71 and 79, Krapf teaches wherein the network supports two-way communication (col. 4, lines 10-15).

As for claims 72, 76 and 80, Armstrong, Krapf, and Jutzi fail to teach wherein the network includes an intranet-based network. The Examiner takes Official Notice that it was well known at the time of Applicant's invention to use an intranet-based network.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Armstrong, Krapf, and Jutzi's invention to include the abovementioned limitation for the advantage of securely sharing information.

As for claims 73, 74, 81, and 82, Krapf teaches wherein the remote location includes an endpoint server which includes a web server and content database (col. 6, lines 8-38, col. 8, lines 38-42).

As for claim 75, Krapf teaches wherein the network supports two-way communication (col. 4, lines 10-15).

As for claims 77-78, Krapf teaches wherein the remote location includes an endpoint server which includes a web server and content database (col. 6, lines 8-38, col. 8, lines 38-42).

5. Claims 55-56, 59-63, 69-70, and 87-94 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Armstrong in view of Krapf, Jutzi, and Kikinis

Claim 55 contains the limitations of claim 1 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to that claim. Claim 55 additionally discloses the following:

the interface link being linked to a commerce site adapted to conduct commerce with the user that is accessible over the network (e.g. In the BMW advertisement, the different entities in the frame are associated with different URLs, and direct the user to different data locations on the same home page. On the web site, a user may conduct a commercial transaction – col. 7, lines 1-17, col. 8, lines 35-38, col. 9, lines 15-24);

accessing the commerce site – (In order to purchase something, the user must be able to access the commerce site - col. 8, lines 23-38, col. 9, lines 9-24); and

displaying the commerce site on the visual display – (In order to purchase something, the user must be able to view the commerce site - col. 8, lines 30-38, col. 9, lines 9-24) .

As for claim 56, Kikinis discloses the step of completing a transaction with the commerce site (As discussed above in claim 55, if the user purchases something, then the user must complete a transaction with the commerce site).

Claim 59 contains the limitations of claim 1 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to that claim. Claim 59 additionally calls for the following:

Encoding and storing the video onto a remote storage medium (memory at the headend) at a first site (headend) – (The STB decodes the data it receives, hence the data is encoded at the headend prior to transmitting it to the STB where it is decoded—col. 5, lines 33-41. Data is recorded (saved) at the headend – Kikinis; col. 6, lines 64-67, col. 7, lines 1-8);

delivering the link program (The advertisement is pre-recorded at the headend where data is recorded to be transmitted between frames identifying the position and extent of an object in the adjacent frame, and associating the object with a specific URL. —Kikinis; col. 6, lines 64-67, col. 7, lines 1-10).

associating the link program with the video (Since the system allows the user to resume playback where last left off, there is a link program; Armstrong);

As for claim 60, Kikinis discloses wherein said associating step includes encoding the link program with the video onto the storage medium – (The advertisement is pre-recorded at the headend where data is recorded to be transmitted between

frames identifying the position and extent of an object in the adjacent frame, and associating the object with a specific URL. - col. 6, lines 64-67, col. 7, lines 1-10).

As for claim 61, Kikinis discloses wherein encoding of the link program is performed simultaneously with said step of encoding the video – (As discussed above in claim 60, since the data associating the object with a specific URL is pre-recorded with the video at the headend, the link program is simultaneously encoded with the video).

As for claim 62, Kikinis discloses wherein the video is received from a cable TV link and/or satellite link – col. 5, lines 33-36, and the link program originates from a web server such that the user could access web data pertinent to the video programming via telephone modem (35) or ISDN (39)– col. 5, lines 55-60, col. 7, lines 60-67, col. 8, lines 1-5.

As for claim 63, Kikinis discloses wherein said delivering step includes the sub-step of overlaying the video with the link program during said displaying step – col. 7, lines 48-67.

Claim 69 contains the limitations of claim 55 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Claim 70 contains the limitations of claim 59 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims.

As for claim 87, Kikinis teaches wherein the network supports two-way communication (col. 7, lines 58-67).

As for claims 88 and 92, Armstrong, Krapf, Kutzi, and Kikinis fail to teach wherein the network includes an intranet-based network. The Examiner takes Official Notice that it was well known at the time of Applicant's invention to use an intranet-based network.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Armstrong, Krapf, and Jutzi's invention to include the abovementioned limitation for the advantage of securely sharing information.

As for claims 89-90, Kikinis teaches wherein the remote location includes an endpoint server which includes a web server and content database (col. 5, lines 17-41).

As for claim 91, Kikinis teaches wherein the network supports two-way communication (col. 7, lines 58-67).

As for claims 93-94, Kikinis teaches wherein the remote location includes an endpoint server which includes a web server and content database (col. 5, lines 17-41).

6. Claims 7 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Armstrong, Krapf, and Jutzi as applied to claim 1 and 31 respectively, above, and further in view of Call (6154738).

As for claims 7 and 34, Armstrong, Krapf and Jutzi fail to disclose wherein said displaying step includes displaying the interface link being at least a partially transparent graphic.

In an analogous art, Call discloses wherein a transparent graphic is displayed to indicate to the user a particular message – col. 19, lines 40-50.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Armstrong, Krapf and Jutzi's system to include wherein partially transparent graphics are displayed, as taught by Call, for the advantage of indicating a particular message to the user.

7. Claims 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Armstrong, Krapf and Jutzi as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Call (6154738).

As for claim 22, Armstrong, Krapf and Jutzi fail to disclose wherein said displaying step includes displaying the interface link being at least a partially transparent graphic.

In an analogous art, Call discloses wherein a transparent graphic is displayed to indicate to the user a particular message – col. 19, lines 40-50.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Armstrong, Krapf and Jutzi's system to include wherein partially transparent graphics are displayed, as taught by Call, for the advantage of indicating a particular message to the user.

8. Claim 46 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Armstrong, Krapf and Jutzi, and Butler as applied to claim 43 above, and further in view of Call (6154738).

As for claim 46, Armstrong, Krapf and Jutzi, and Butler fail to disclose wherein said displaying step includes displaying the interface link being at least a partially transparent graphic.

In an analogous art, Call discloses wherein a transparent graphic is displayed to indicate to the user a particular message – col. 19, lines 40-50.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Armstrong, Krapf and Jutzi, and Butler's system to

include wherein partially transparent graphics are displayed, as taught by Call, for the advantage of indicating a particular message to the user.

9. Claims 9 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Armstrong, Krapf and Jutzi as applied to claims 1 and 31 above, respectively, and further in view of Alonso (6184878).

As for claims 9 and 36, Armstrong, Krapf and Jutzi fail to disclose wherein said displaying step includes displaying an interface link that provides the appearance of moving across the screen of the visual display as the video is being played.

In an analogous art, Alonso discloses wherein moving images are displayed such that the subscriber may dynamically interact it – col. 7, lines 25-35.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Armstrong, Krapf and Jutzi's system to include wherein moving images are displayed, as taught by Alonso, for the advantage of allowing the subscriber to dynamically interact with it.

10. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Armstrong, Krapf and Jutzi as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Alonso (6184878).

As for claim 24, Armstrong, Krapf and Jutzi fail to disclose wherein said displaying step includes displaying an interface link that provides the appearance of moving across the screen of the visual display as the video is being played.

In an analogous art, Alonso discloses wherein moving images are displayed such that the subscriber may dynamically interact it – col. 7, lines 25-35.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Armstrong, Krapf and Jutzi's system to include wherein moving images are displayed, as taught by Alonso, for the advantage of allowing the subscriber to dynamically interact with it.

11. Claim 48 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Armstrong, Krapf, Jutzi, and Butler, as applied to claim 43 above, and further in view of Alonso (6184878).

As for claim 48, Armstrong, Krapf Jutzi, and Butler fail to disclose wherein said displaying step includes displaying an interface link that provides the appearance of moving across the screen of the visual display as the video is being displayed.

In an analogous art, Alonso discloses wherein moving images are displayed such that the subscriber may dynamically interact it – col. 7, lines 25-35.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Armstrong, Krapf, Jutzi, and Butler's system to include

wherein moving images are displayed, as taught by Alonso, for the advantage of allowing the subscriber to dynamically interact with it.

12. Claims 43-45, 47, 49, 50-54, 64-65, 68, and 83-86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

103(a) as being unpatentable over Armstrong in view of Krapf, Jutzi, and Butler (US 2002/0007493).

Claim 43 contains limitations of claim 31 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Claim 43 additionally calls for:

The overlaid interface link being linked to ancillary content (See Krapf, col. 4, lines 4-15).

Displaying an overlaid interface link with the video based on the time elapsed during the display of the video.

However, Armstrong, Krapf, and Jutzi fail to disclose displaying content based on the time elapsed during the display of the video.

In an analogous art, Butler teaches displaying content based on timing specifications for the advantage of indicating times for displaying content relative to the video stream – [0019].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Armstrong, Krapf, and Jutzi's invention to include

displaying content based on timing specifications, as taught by Butler, for the advantage of indicating times for displaying content relative to the video stream.

As for claim 44, Armstrong discloses interrupting the streaming includes pausing the video (col. 2, line 60-col. 3, line 3).

As for claims 45, Krapf discloses wherein the interface link (web location) is hidden from view until the viewer selects the image, resulting in invoking a linked URL which leads to a web location which provides information related to the image – col. 3, lines 43-56.

As for claim 47, Krapf discloses wherein different entities in a frame may be associated with different URLs, and may serve to direct the user to the particular web page (primary ancillary content) when the image is selected. The user browses the particular web page which has links on it and then further accesses a link on the web page by selecting it. The link takes the user to a secondary web page (second ancillary content) which allows the user to access additional desired information— col. 4, lines 4-14.

As for claim 49, Armstrong discloses wherein the user may buy (commercial transaction) a dealer's product through the web page for the advantage of allowing the process of buying a product through his TV set – col. 12, lines 39-45.

As for claim 50, Krapf discloses wherein the user may purchase good or services. As this is possible, the system inherently has a link to a site adapted to transact the commercial transaction for the advantage of allowing the process of buying a product from a vendor – col. 12, lines 39-45.

As for claim 51, Krapf discloses wherein said interacting step includes accessing ancillary content including information relating to the video. The alternative subject matter data is associated with the program of the channel - col. 6, lines 39-42.

As for claim 52, Krapf discloses wherein said interacting step includes accessing ancillary content including video. The streaming video data includes the alternative subject matter (ancillary content) - col. 6, lines 36-40. The alternative subject matter is saved as compressed video - col. 7, lines 4-9.

As for claim 53, Krapf discloses the user may purchase a product using the ancillary content for the advantage of allowing the process of buying a product from a vendor – col. 12, lines 39-45.

As for claim 54, Krapf discloses the video may be associated with different URLs, and may serve to direct the user to a plurality of web sites – col. 4, lines 4-14.

As for claim 64, Butler teaches the step of measuring includes interacting with a time code marker embedded in the video – [0019].

As for claim 65, Armstrong, Krapf, and Jutzi fail to disclose embedding a time code marker in the video to permit the display of an interface link to the ancillary content based on the time elapsed during the display of the video.

In an analogous art, Butler teaches embedding a time code marker (timing specification) in the video to permit the display of an interface link (hyperlink overlay) to the ancillary content (supplemental content) based on the time elapsed during the display of the video – [0019], [0021].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Armstrong, Krapf, and Jutzi's invention to include the above mentioned limitation, as taught by Butler, for the advantage of displaying supplemental content at the appropriate time.

Claim 68 contains the limitations of claim 43 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims.

As for claim 83, Krapf teaches wherein the network supports two-way communication (col. 4, lines 10-15).

As for claim 84, Armstrong, Krapf, Jutzi, and Butler fail to teach wherein the network includes an intranet-based network. The Examiner takes Official Notice that it was well known at the time of Applicant's invention to use an intranet-based network.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Armstrong, Krapf, Jutzi, and Butler's invention to include the abovementioned limitation for the advantage of securely sharing information.

As for claims 85-86, Krapf teaches wherein the remote location includes an endpoint server which includes a web server and content database (col. 6, lines 8-38, col. 8, lines 38-42).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SUMAIYA A. CHOWDHURY whose telephone number is (571)272-8567. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 9-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Miller can be reached on (571) 272-7353. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/John W. Miller/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2421

/Sumaiya A Chowdhury/
Examiner, Art Unit 2421

